



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,768	10/29/2001	Eric H. Baehrecke	4115-131	3246
23448	7590	08/05/2005	EXAMINER	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY / TECHNOLOGY LAW PO BOX 14329 RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709				DAVIS, MINH TAM B
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1642				

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	10/016,768	Applicant(s) BAEHRECKE, ERIC H.
Examiner MINH-TAM DAVIS	Art Unit 1642	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 April 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: 1,2,26 and 27.
 Claim(s) objected to: none.
 Claim(s) rejected: 20 and 28.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See attached.
 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
 13. Other: See attached notice of references, which is necessitated to response to the new amendment.

DETAILED ACTION

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Accordingly, claims 1-2, 20, 26-28 are being examined.

Claims 1-2, 26-27 seem to be free of prior art and are allowable.

The following are the remaining rejections.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH, SCOPE

Rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph of claims 20, 28 pertaining to lack of enablement for a variant of SEQ ID NO:8 remains for reasons already of record in paper of 03/03/05.

Applicant amends claims 20, 28 to be drawn only to variants that include conservative substitutions.

Applicant argues that the conservative residues 353-504 indicate that they are orthologues, which are proteins with the same function in different species. Applicant argues that a protein with at least 95% identity would be considered to exhibit high homology, and that one could readily run a Blast program to detect the sequences with high homology.

Applicant argues that determining whether a sequence confers cell death is a simple assay, and one can easily perform such test, and thus it would not be undue experimentation.

Applicant's arguments set forth in paper of 01/18/05 have been considered but are not deemed to be persuasive for the following reasons:

Although conservative substitutions increase the chance of having less effect on the activity of the protein, it is unpredictable which amino acid at a certain position could be substituted even by conservative substitution. For example, Straub P et al, 1993, J Biol Chem 268(29): 21997-20003, teach that conservative substitutions of valine for glycine at positions 111 and 117 of cytochrome P450 2C2 result in about 50- and 7-fold reduction of activity, respectively. Kouklis PD et al, 1993, J Cell Science, 106(pt 3): 919-28, teach that a single exchange of glycine 450 of the intermediate filament protein vimentin with valine strongly interferes with the normal assembly of the intermediate filaments.

Further, it is noted that although the residues 353-405 of SEQ ID NO:8 seems to have some similarity among human SEQ ID NO:8, Drosophila E93, fish, mouse and nematode E93, one cannot predict whether said residues 353-405 either could confer or are sufficient to confer the induction of cell death.

Since one does not know which fragment of SEQ ID NO:8 confers induction of cell death, the variants of claims 20, 28 could have conservative substitutions at any amino acids throughout the full length of SEQ ID NO:8, and it would be random experimentation to make or screen for the claimed 95% variants.

It is noted that screening assays do not enable the claimed invention because the court found in *Rochester v. Searle*, 358 F.3d 916, Fed Cir., 2004, teaches that

screening assays are not sufficient to enable an invention because they are merely a wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention.

Thus it would be undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to practice the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MINH-TAM DAVIS whose telephone number is 571-272-0830. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JEFFREY SIEW can be reached on 571-272-0787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SUSAN UNGAR, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER

MINH TAM DAVIS

Application/Control Number: 10/016,768
Art Unit: 1642

Page 5

July 25, 2005